DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 382 HE 001 345

AUTHOR Counelis, James Steve
TITLE The Undergraduate Major in Political Science.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE May 69
NOTE 98p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.00
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes, *College Majors, *Departments, Educational Objectives, *Higher Education, Institutional Role, Intellectual Disciplines, Political Attitudes, *Political Science, *Student Characteristics, Student Interests, Student Motivation, Student Opinion, Student Teacher Relationship, Units of Study (Subject Fields)
IDENTIFIERS *California University Berkeley

ABSTRACT

The Undergraduate Studies Committee in the Political Science Department at Berkeley designed this self-study for the purpose of understanding more clearly the experiences political science majors have in the department. The first part of the study was a "study in depth" which consisted of interviewing some 60 undergraduate majors in political science. The second part was the administration of a 66-item multiple-choice questionnaire to the 645 undergraduate majors; 307 were returned. This report is based upon the questionnaire data only. The questionnaire dealt with such areas as: father's occupation and income, background (urban or rural), academic plans, occupational and degree objectives, preferences in job characteristics, political views, political party preferences, special fields of interest within political science, frequency of class attendance and completion of readings, relationships to faculty advisors, perceptions of faculty political views; and opinions on the relation of class size to learning, adequacy of present class time, purposes of political science, major functions of the University, disciplines relevant to political science, and the comparative difficulty of the study of political science to the study of history and sociology. Forty tables document the discussion. (DS)

ED035382

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY

THE UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR

IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

James Steve Counelis

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

April 1969

HE001 345

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PREFACE

Departmental self-study is a significant professional activity within the university. It is institutional introspection, rationally conceived. Such self-study connotes the departmental and professional faculty need for organizational intelligence about one of its two primary services, instruction. Self-study is the prior rational stage to decision-making and institutional action. Like persons, an institution requires a reality testing device. Without self-study, the department cannot relate relevantly to the world outside and within the ivory tower.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee in the Department of Political Science of the University of California, Berkeley, designed this self study. To use the language of the Committee to

its students:

> . . .We are . . .in an attempt to understand more clearly the experiences political science majors have as they carry on their work in the department.

There were two parts of the Committee's work. The first part was a "study in depth" which consisted of interviewing some sixty undergraduate majors in political science, these interviews being conducted through the Committee auspices. The second part of the self-study was the design and administration of a 66 multiple choice item questionnaire. This written report is based upon the survey questionnaire data only. The interview materials are an incorporated part of the records of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

On the basis of the interviews, the substantive character of the questionnaire was determined. With the technical and financial aid of the Office of Institutional Research, the questionnaire was refined for use. Time prohibited the Committee doing a pilot study and item analysis on the questionnaire prior to distribution.

Near the end of the 1967 Spring Quarter, the questionnaire was mailed to 645 undergraduate majors in political science who were registered that quarter. With the aid of one "tickler" letter, some 307 questionnaires were returned in varying stages of completion. This was a 47.6 per cent return.

To take the data of a group's social research project and write a report upon their data is no easy task. But the experience

substantively was interesting and useful; and I must admit there were several moments of challenge. The primary orientation of the Committee's work became my orientation. It was and is still my hope that an adequate and fair reading of the data is presented below. It is also my hope that this report provides in summary fashion some of the knowledge and understanding about undergraduate major in political science sought by the Undergraduate Studies Committee for the Department of Political Science.

I am indebted to Mr. Sidney Suslow, Director of the Office of Institutional Research in the University of California, Berkeley, for the opportunity to work on this project and for his reading of the manuscript. To Professor Todd R. LaPorte, Chairman of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, I am indebted for his reading, comments and knowledge that aided me in this work, as well as access to the interview materials. I am most appreciative of the aid and background information on this self-study provided by Miss Eleanor Langlois of this office. And finally, I am grateful to the secretarial staff of the Office of Institutional Research for their expert preparation of this manuscript. Of course all responsibility for interpretation and error rests with the writer.

James Steve Counelis

Office of Institutional Research
University of California
Berkeley, California
April 7, 1969

THE UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

by

James Steve Counelis

David Braybrooke in an insightful introductory essay to his anthology, Philosophical Problems in the Social Sciences, presents a useful distinction on the general approaches to social science inquiry.[1] The distinction he makes is between behavioral and action research. Action research is inquiry into the meaning and the situational wholeness of human acts. Behavioral research is founded upon the specific acts and behaviors of individual persons. Though social scientists know that there is weaving of these emphases in their researches, there is usually a primacy of one of these ontological commitments. In this study on the undergraduate major in political science at Berkeley, the data may very well be considered behavioral modules; but the total conceptualization of this study is actional.

An important assumption in the theory of case study method is that the case under study is considered to be a micro-analogue of the whole class from which the case is drawn. "The case" in this paper is the Berkeley undergraduate major in political science and

his relation to department and university. It is a partial study. This case is a micro-analogue of the general class of undergraduate majors found in any academic department of a high quality public university.

What is the situational wholeness in which the undergraduate major in political science lives? What meaning does he attach to his academic life in the department and the university? What does he bring to the UC Berkeley Department of Political Science? What does he see and value in the Department of Political Science? A summary glimpse follows.

The situational wholeness in which all university students live is the department and university. The meaning of that total environment lies in the mission of the university. The undergraduate political science major subscribes to the credo and mission of intellectualism and social criticism found in the university. His goals are academic rather than vocational. His proclivities for domestic and foreign affairs areas of his discipline, humanistically understood, fit within his commitment to intellectualism and social criticism.

His career goals, are for service in the law, government and college teaching. These vocations fit his intellectual and liberal tendencies as do his criteria for vocational choice, viz., (1) interesting work with a feeling of accomplishment; (2) opportunity to be helpful. He is a serious student, taking advantage of the

educational opportunities of resources and persons. Coupling this seriousness with his urban, middle class, white collar, and comparatively affluent background, his vocational goals become highly probable and his life style humane and urbane.

The undergraduate major in political science has the following perceptions about his discipline and the departmental faculty. A humanistic orientation to political science is very strong. Political science is ranked midway between history and sociology in level of difficulty. His perception of his instructors' political values as being similar to his own liberal leanings is apparent. His impression of the political science instructor as a scholar, sympathetic but non-involved with his students, appears strongly. From the faculty viewpoint the undergraduate major's intellectualism, humanistic and liberal orientation, and his serious purposes are ideal qualities.

In reviewing the interview material, I found a complement to the statistical portrait of the undergraduate major in political science. This complement was the affective dimension of the statistical portrait. Certainly, I found undergraduates who appeared sometimes to be sophisticated, sometimes naive, though generally attempting to use their emotions and their intellect for purposes of self-exploration and personal identification. The seeking after contacts with instructors and peers is a pursuit of an adequate image-style for each to copy. The preference for openness and truth, exploratory adventures in human experiences, intellectuality, competence,

independence and personal integrity in knowing one's self and the world seem to be the hallmarks of these students as a group, though individually they would run the gamut of human possibilities.

II

Academic departments in American colleges and universities consist of two inter-related elements, viz., the faculty and the student clientele serviced by that faculty. The socio-economic characteristics of the students mirror the social class appeal of both the university and the department's discipline. Further, these characteristics of students can color perceptibly the curriculum taught in classroom and laboratory[2]. Indeed, this study by the Department of Political Science was done to aid the department's orderly evaluation and planning of curriculum change to fit the students. A profile of the socio-economic background of the undergraduate political science majors in the University of California, Berkeley, follows.

The following are the basic facts of age, sex, marital status, and

geographic background. The modal ages of juniors and seniors were 21 years and 22 years, respectively. Two-thirds of the surveyed students were male. This proportion of males in the sample population is identical to the proportion of masculine names on the orginal list of registered students used as the mailing list for the questionnaire. Nearly 90 per cent of the undergraduate political science majors surveyed had never been married. The proportional division of juniors and seniors was 41 and 59 per cent respectively. In terms of the rural-urban backgrounds of the undergraduate major in political science, the proportional distribution approximated the order of magnitude for the rural-urban distribution in California's 1960 census. (See Table No.1). About 17 per cent of the surveyed students came from rural areas; and 83 per cent came from urban residences. Some 92 per cent of the surveyed students gave California as their permanent residence.

The middle class background of the undergraduate major is revealed by their fathers' occupation and family income. Table No. 2 presents comparative distributions of fathers' occupation and the 1967 distribution of occupations on the labor force. About 76 per cent of the student respondents indicated that their fathers had occupations in the "white collar" classification as defined by the U.S. Bureau of Census, whereas the 1967 census distribution of white collar workers was 46.5 per cent. In this context, the white collar classification is equated with middle class.

TABLE NO. 1: COMPARATIVE URBAN-RURAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF 1960 CALIFORNIA POPULATION AND BERKELEY UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE SURVEYED, 1967

RESIDENCE AREAS	CALIFORNIA POPULATION 1960† (in 1,000's)		BERKELEY STUDENTS SURVEYED, 1967	
	N	%	N	%
RURAL	2,144	13.6	53	16.9
URBAN	13,577	86.4	261	83.1
TOTAL	15,721	100.0	314	100.0

† U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1967 (88th ed.; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 17.

TABLE NO. 2: COMPARATIVE PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF U.S. MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS (1967) AND FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS OF BERKELEY UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE (1967).

MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS	CENSUS: 1967†		STUDENTS' FATHERS	
	%	CUM. %	%	CUM. %
White Collar Workers:				
Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers	13.7		34.4	
Managers, Officers, Proprietors (except farms)	10.0		28.8	
Clerical and Sales Workers	22.8		12.6	
Subtotal	46.5	46.5	75.8	75.8
Blue Collar Workers:				
Craftsmen and Foremen	13.2		7.4	
Operatives	18.8		1.3	
Laborers (except farm and mine)	4.3		2.3	
Subtotal	36.3	82.8	11.0	86.8
Service Workers:				
Private Household and other services	12.9	95.7	4.5	91.3
Farm Workers:				
Farmers, Managers, Laborers, Foremen	4.3	100.0	.6	91.9
Others:				
Untabulated	----	----	8.1	100.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

† Percents calculated from 1967 data in, Table No. 327: Employed Persons, By Major Occupation Group and Sex, 1950-1967, in U.S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1967 (88th ed.; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 230.

In the Appendix Chart No. 1 provides a socio-economic prestige scale of occupations in accord with Duncan's SEC index.[3] The mean index score for all occupations measured by Duncan is 30, and the data show that the students in the UC Berkeley Department of Political Science come from families high up on the Duncan index, these scores ranging from 45 to 75 for the white collar classification of occupations in the labor force. In fact, the white collar occupational group is over-represented in the professional and managerial categories and under-represented in the sales and clerical categories. Further the non-white collar workers are substantially under represented. The comparisons are made against the 1967 labor force distributions of occupations.

Comparative proportional distributions of the parental income of Berkeley undergraduate majors in political science and the 1967 national distribution of family incomes are provided in Table No. 3. These students in political science come from high income families. About 19 per cent of the student respondents recorded family incomes in excess of $25,000 per annum; and some 24 per cent indicated family incomes between $15,000 and $24,999 per annum. Sixty-nine per cent of the students had family incomes in excess of $10,000 per year and only 4.6 per cent of the student respondents came from families below $4,000 per annum group. The economic class discrepancy is very great.

The seven groups of majors, viz., American Government, Political Theory, International Relations, Comparative Government,

TABLE NO. 3: COMPARATIVE PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF 1966 U.S. FAMILY INCOMES BY LEVELS AND FAMILY INCOMES REPORTED BY BERKELEY UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE (1967).

U. S. FAMILY INCOMES LEVELS IN 1966 DOLLARS	CENSUS: 1966	BERKELEY STUDENTS' FAMILY INCOMES (%)	+/- PERCENT REPRESENTATION
Under $1000 - $3999	21.1	4.6	-16.5
$4000 - $5999	15.5	7.3	- 8.2
$6000 - $7999	18.7	8.9	- 9.8
$8000 - $9999	15.1	10.3	- 4.8
$10,000 - $14,999	20.4	26.8	+ 6.4
$15,000 - $24,999	7.5	23.5	+16.0
Over $25,000	1.7	18.6	+16.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	-----

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Populations Reports: Consumer Income (Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967). Series P-60, No. 52 (August 21, 1967), p. 3.

Public Law, Political Parties/Political Behavior, and Public Administration, differ significantly from each other only in terms of concentration of students with given parental income. Two non-parametric rank tests' results provide the basis for the inferences about these differences. (See Charts Nos. 1-5 in Appendix).

The undergraduate political science major at Berkeley must often finance a part of his education. Only 14 per cent of the students surveyed recorded that they did not earn any part of their income while attending the university. About 86 per cent did earn some or all of the income while in university residence. In fact, almost a quarter of the students responding (24.1%) earned all or nearly all of their own support while in residence.

The curricular goals of most of these students in political science seem to be well formed. Table No. 4 provides a distribution of the student responses on future attendance to graduate or professional school. Over two-thirds of the surveyed students (71.6%) responded that they were intending to attend graduate or professional schools. Of this group, about 31 per cent were planning on law school; and some 24 per cent were intending to go to graduate school for work in political science or public administration. The remaining 28.4 per cent were not going on to advanced work immediately after convocation or they had not decided their direction.

TABLE NO. 4 POST-BACCALAUREATE PIANS AND INTENTIONS

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

Do you intend to go on to graduate or professional school after completing your bachelor's degree?

RESPONSES	N	%
YES: Political Science or Public Administration.	73	24.2
YES: Another Social Science.	16	5.3
YES: Law School.	94	31.2
YES: Other than Law School or other Social Science.	33	10.9
NO: Not at this time.	46	15.2
NO: Have not decided.	40	13.2
TOTAL	302	100.0

Curricular goals are steered toward occupational ends. Table No. 5 provides a distribution of the student responses on the type of vocation they intended to enter. Law, government and college teaching were the dominate callings. Some 20 per cent of the student respondents reported they had not made a vocational decision as yet.

It is reasonable to expect vocational goals to be related to curricular means. This proved to be the case for the undergraduate political science majors. Their occupational goals appear to be related to their major in political science. A Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks H was calculated to be 20.37, with a significance level at .001 (χ^2 = 16.81, 6 df.). Hence, the students in the several majors differ in terms of their occupational goals when the groups are considered as wholes. (See Chart Nos. 6-7 in the Appendix.)

The following are those occupations most often selected by the students in the majors: (1) American Government, teaching in the elementary schools and the secondary schools; (2) Political Theory, college teaching; (3) International Relations, international government; (4) Comparative Government, college teaching; (5) Public Law, law and business; (6) Public Administration, government service. The field of political parties and political behavior has a small fractionated distribution, though clearly their occupational interests seem to be away from the academic sphere, viz., law,

TABLE NO. 5 POST-UNIVERSITY VOCATIONAL INTENTIONS

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

At this time, what sort of work do you intend to go into after you complete your University education?

RESPONSES	N	%
Government: International, National, State Local Levels.	61	20.7
Law.	81	27.5
Teaching:		
College level;	35)	
Elementary and Secondary levels.	24)	20.0
Business and other professions.	10	3.4
Other.	26	8.8
No decision.	58	19.6
TOTAL	295	100.0

business and government service.

The ultimate degree objectives of these students in political science are beyond baccalureate level. Only 3.3 per cent of the political science majors responding stated the bachelor's degree to be their ultimate goal. Though 18 per cent had not yet made a decision, some 79 per cent of the student respondents viewed their goals to be an advanced degree in some academic field or a professional degree. In accord with their occupational intents, these degree objectives seem appropiate. See Table No. 6 for the frequency and proportional distributions of student responses on degree goals.

Table No. 7 provides a frequency and proportional distribution of student responses to a question of preferences for certain job criteria. The job criteria were: (1) high income; (2) stable and secure future; (3) short working hours; (4) chances for advancement; (5) interesting work and feeling of accomplishment; (6) opportunity to influence important decisions; (7) independence; (8) opportunity to be helpful. By far the most important job criterion for the undergraduate in political science responding to this question was his interest in and accomplishment gained from the job. The second most important criterion of a job was the student's opportunity to be helpful. The least important consideration was short hours.

If one reflects carefully upon the socio-economic character of

TABLE NO. 6: FINAL DEGREE OBJECTIVE

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

What is your ultimate degree objective?

RESPONSES	N	%
Baccalaureate	10	3.3
Law Degree	89	29.6
Master's Degree	57	18.9
Doctorate	54	17.9
Miscellaneous:		
Other Professional Degree	10)	
Teaching Credential	12)	
Other	15)	12.4
No Decision	54	17.9
TOTAL	301	100.0

TABLE NO. 7: PREFERENCES IN JOB CHARACTERISTICS

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

Which of the items in this list would you prefer in a job? (Please put a "1" next to the most important, a "2" next to the second most important, and a "0" next to the least important to you.)

RESPONSES	"1"		"2"		"0"	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. High income	6	2.0	30	10.3	60	21.1
2. Stable and secure future	5	1.7	18	6.2	55	19.4
3. Short working hours	7	2.3	17	5.8	115	40.4
4. Chances for advancement	5	1.7	9	3.1	13	4.6
5. Interesting work and feeling of accomplishment	207	69.5	43	14.8	1	.4
6. Opportunity to influence important decisions	18	6.0	50	17.2	18	6.3
7. Independence	30	10.1	47	16.2	5	1.8
8. Opportunity to be helpful	20	6.7	77	26.4	17	6.0
TOTAL	298	100.0	291	100.0	284	100.0

the undergraduate majors in political science in Berkeley, it should not come as a surprise that the Department of Political Science is a middle class department. Political science as a curriculum is not a direct career preparation program such as the baccalaureate programs in engineering, optometry and medical technology. Indeed, students who come from non-white collar background would view political science as a less direct pragmatic approach to an occupation.[4] Middle class aspirations are reflected in the 72 per cent of the student respondents setting goals in occupations related to the law, government service and teaching, primarily at the college level. These middle class or white-collar aspirations require a socio-economic background that can support and sustain the material accomplishment of these long term occupational goals. Of particular interest are those 20 per cent of the student respondents who had not decided upon specific occupational goals. Whether this lack of decision-making in occupational goals is social class related needs to be investigated; however, the data in this present form and extent do not admit of this investigation here.

The political views of the students majoring in political science are of a natural interest. Table No. 8 presents cross tabulation of student responses regarding political party preferences and student classification of their own political views into the categories radical, liberal and conservative. Notably, no student indicated preference for the Communist Party. In terms of general political persuasion,

TABLE NO. 8 FREQUENCY AND PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' POLITICAL VIEWS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' PARTY PREFERENCES.

STUDENT POLITICAL VIEWS	STUDENT PARTY PREFERENCES				TOTAL
	Dem.	Rep.	Indep.	Social.	
CONSERVATIVE	1	27	2	1	31
LIBERAL	125	23	48	14	210
RADICAL	6	0	5	14	25
TOTAL	132	50	55	29	266

some 79 per cent of the student respondents considered themselves to be liberal. Nine per cent considered themselves to be radical and about 12 per cent viewed their political persuasion as conservative. Party preferences are more diverse. About 50 per cent of the student respondees preferred the Democratic Party while some 19 per cent preferred the Republican Party. About 21 per cent of the students considered themselves to be political independents; and some 11 per cent were socialist. There is little doubt that the student responses to political party preference were strongly correlated with their categorization of their political views. The distributions in the cross tabu. tions could have arisen by chance only once in a thousand times. When the question is asked as to whether the several groups of political science majors differ in the factors of their political party preferences and personal political views, the answer is that no difference exist. (See Charts Nos. 8-12 for statistical analysis.)

The profile of the undergraduate major in Berkeley's Department of Political Science can be briefly summarized. The student is more often male than female, between 21 and 22 years of age, and single. He comes from urban California. His family tends to be middle class, white collar and affluent. His occupational goals are professional ones leading to careers in the law, government service, college teaching and teaching in the lower schools, vocations long recognized in their opportunities for high personal interest, intellectuality, self-satisfaction, and service. His educational goals are tailored to meet these occupational aspirations. Politically, the undergraduate

major in political science believes himself to be of liberal persuasion and his party perference, predominantly Democratic, appears to be dictated by that liberal orientation.

III

The Berkeley undergraduate in political science believes the main function of the university is to be a center of intellectual life and critical social analysis. Some 84 per cent of the responding students to a question on the main functions of the university so reported. Table No. 9 contains the proportional distributions of the student's responses. Also it is significant to note the students' selection of the second most important function, which was, to establish a sense of community among scholars and students. Further these two functions of the university seem to be held across all fields of concentration by undergraduate political science majors. (See Charts Nos. 13-15 in Appendix for statistical analysis.) Together these two functions mutually support an esprit de corps toward the ends of scholarship.

TABLE NO. 9: THE MAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

What do you think the main function of a university should be? (Please put a "1" to the most important, a "2" next to the second most important, and a "0" to the least important.)

RESPONSES	"1"		"2"		"0"	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Promote scientific progress.	2	.7	54	20.1	11	4.1
2. Provide the occupational structure needed skills and capabilities.	17	6.1	61	22.7	24	9.0
3. Contribute to strengthening the position of the U.S. in international competition.	4	1.4	4	1.5	164	61.7
4. Be centers of intellectual life and of critical analysis of society.	236	84.3	24	8.9	1	.4
5. Develop research oriented to direct utilization by industry and government agencies.	3	1.1	14	5.2	39	14.6
6. Establish a sense of community between scholars and students	18	6.4	112	41.6	27	10.2
TOTAL	280	100.0	269	100.0	266	100.0

Thus the undergraduate student majors in political science apparently uphold the epistemic mission of the University over the utilitarian functions of an occupational training center or a developmental agency for business, industry and government. Hence the primary role of the university is congruent with the primary role of the student. The following section provides a description of how the undergraduate political science major in Berkeley experiences and interacts with the department and university.

The primary behaviors of university students are epistemic in content, viz, behaviors manifesting knowledge possessing, knowledge seeking, knowledge evaluating, and/or knowledge utilizing. However, the content of these learning behaviors must be couched relevantly within the values and commitments held by the Berkeley political sciences majors on the functions of the university and the goals of political science as a curriculum.

The intellectual function of the university is supported coherently in its dominant orientation by the student's opinions on the curricular purpose of political science. Collectively, some 77 per cent of the responding students indicated that the political science curriculum should aim at two academic ends: (1) the development of concepts for examining political science; (2) the examination of the normative bases of political society. Table No. 10 presents a proportional distribution of the respondees' opinions on alternative political science curricular goals. There is little

TABLE NO. 10: STUDENT ORIENTATION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

Which of the statements below most nearly typify your own orientation toward political science? (Please put a "1" next to the most typical, and a "2" next to the second most typical.)

RESPONSES	"1"		"2"	
	N	%	N	%
1. Political science should be aimed at giving students the knowledge and motivation to be effective participants in our democratic political system.	48	16.2	59	21.1
2. Political science should be aimed at developing concepts in ways of examining the characteristics of political phenomena so that they are more thoroughly understood and explained.	138	46.6	85	30.4
3. Political science should be aimed at examining the philosophical and normative basis of political life in various societies.	90	30.4	96	34.3
4. Political science should be aimed at providing training for various governmental occupations and the teaching of political science.	7	2.4	34	12.1
5. Other (specify):	13	4.4	6	2.1
TOTAL	296	100.0	280	100.0

question that the commitment of the Berkeley political science undergraduate majors is to political science as an intellectual enterprise. This intellectualism probably reinforces the faculty's commitment and graduate orientation, thus, together creating the dominant ethos of the Department of Political Science. Whether this ethos of intellectualism is tolerant and permits the survival of those students with occupational and political action concerns is worthy of investigation. Further, the intellectual ethos is the appropriate supportive environment for inducing the theoretical research orientation required in graduate education. Hence, the Department of Political Science at Berkeley becomes a potentially effective feeder organization for graduate schools. In fact, the University of California, Berkeley, is the nation's first rank producer of baccalaureates across all fields who get doctorates.[5]

What epistemic behaviors characterize the Berkeley undergraduate major in political science? Information on specific interest fields, class attendance, reading patterns, academic counseling and student learning groups provide some partial answers.

What sub-fields in political science do Berkeley undergraduates study? One question attempted to get data on this issue. Of the responding students some 115 or 42 per cent were in foreign affairs fields, vis., international relations, comparative government, and area studies. The second largest group of students, 75 in number (27.2%), declared domestic public affairs fields, vis., American

government, public law, jurisprudence, public policy and public administration. Political theory ranked third with 32 students (11.6%). The last and smallest group, 12 students (4.3%), were in the behavioral fields of political parties, pressure groups, public opinion and mass political behavior. About 15 per cent of the students did not specify fields of interest (42) students). This distribution of student sub-field interests seems to be related to the students' opinions on the relevancy of other disciplines to political science. (See Table No. 11).

One question asked the students to select from a list of disciplines those which he believed were most relevant, second most relevant, and least relevant to his study of political science. Table No. 12 displays the proportional distribution of the students' responses. The rank order of the student responses on the most relevant disciplines to political science was: (1) history; (2) sociology; (3) economics; (4) foreign languages; (5) philosophy; (6) psychology; (7) anthropology; (8) mathematics and statistics. Considering the specific political science sub-fields in which these students' interests reside, this rank order appears reasonable as the predominant emphasis upon history (43.6%) and sociology (24.4%) illustrates. (See Charts 16-18 in Appendix.)

Of particular interest here is the very low valuation placed by the undergraduate majors in political science upon mathematics

TABLE NO. 11: UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' SPECIAL FIELDS OF INTEREST

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

What do you think of as your specialized field of interest within political science?

RESPONSES	N	%
FOREIGN AFFAIRS:		
(a) International Relations	66	
(b) Comparative Givernment - Area Studies	49	
Subtotal	115	41.7
DOMESTIC AFFAIRS:		
(a) American Government	28	
(b) Public Law and Jurisprudence	30	
(c) Public Administration and Public Policy	17	
Subtotal	75	27.2
Political Behavior	12	4.3
Political Theory	32	11.6
No Field Specified	42	15.2
TOTAL	276	100.0

TABLE NO. 12: DISCIPLINES RELEVANT TO POLITICAL SCIENCE

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

On the disciplines list below, which are most relvant to your interests in political science? (Please put a "1" by the most relevant, a "2" by the second most relevant and a "0" by the least relevant.)

DISCIPLINES	"1"		"2"		"0"	
	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
1. Anthropology	4.0	6.5	6.9	7.0	9.0	3.0
2. Economics	9.1	3.0	20.9	2.0	2.7	5.0
3. Foreign Languages	6.9	5.0	7.9	6.0	21.0	2.0
4. History	43.6	1.0	22.7	1.0	1.1	7.5
5. Mathematics/Statistics	.4	8.0	.7	8.0	54.6	1.0
6. Philosophy	7.6	4.0	10.5	5.0	7.3	4.0
7. Psychology	4.0	6.5	11.2	4.0	2.3	6.0
8. Sociology	24.4	2.0	19.2	3.0	1.1	7.5
TOTAL	100.0		100.0		100.0	

and statistics in their relevancy to political science. This is surprising inasmuch as the trend and growth in political science has been toward its empiricization, especially in the political behavioral fields. It is also notable that none of the 12 students in the political behavioral fields found high relevance for mathematics and statistics in his field of inquiry. A cross classification of relevant disciplines by student interest sub-fields, not displayed here revealed this fact.

If one grants the learning purpose of class attendance, a look at the self-report data on it is appropiate. About 93 per cent of the responding students stated that they attended three-fourths or more of the faculty lectures. And about 85 per cent of these same students noted attending three-fourths or more of the class sessions taught by teaching assistants. It is apparent that the majors in political science felt direct instruction necessary. Also, there is no statistical difference in the patterns of class attendance for the several majors in political science. (See Charts Nos. 19-20 in the Appendix for statistical analysis.)

Reading is fundamental to a university education and two questions were posed regarding reading assignments. A definite pattern appears in the responses to these questions. When inquiry is made about the required readings in the typical course, 85 per cent of the political science majors surveyed reported that they read three-fourths or more of the required reading. In terms of

the recommended collateral or optional reading assignments, some 94 per cent of the student responses indicated the students were reading one-half or less of these supplementary assignments. Though the inverse relation in these proportions is expected, the attempt of the students to spread their reading over both classes of reading assignments is a significant educational fact. Of course, the degree of balance in the proportions of the kinds of assigned readings done rests with the individual student's needs and his perception of the character of the course taught by a particular faculty member. To these findings, one must add that the patterns of reading required and recommended materials are not significantly different for the several majors in political science. (See Charts Nos. 21-23 in the Appendix for statistical analysis.)

Faculty advising can be a significant learning opportunity for students. This depends, nonetheless, upon its frequency and the quality of its contents.

Sixteen per cent of the students responded to a question on advising frequency noted that they did not seek nor did they receive any formal counseling from a political science faculty advisor. Another 68 per cent noted that they had seen their advisor between one and two times within the school year of 1966-1967. A third group, only 16 per cent stated that they saw their advisor three or more times within the same school year. Hence, some 84 per cent of the undergraduates in political science who answered this question had seen advisors at least once.

In the other than formal advising context of the Department of Political Science, what frequency of faculty-student contacts seems to obtain? Two parallel questions were asked. One item was on the frequency of student visits with professors who were not currently a student's course instructor. The second was on the frequency of student visits with course professors. With reference to course instructor contacts, about 22 per cent of the responding political science majors noted that they did not visit with the course instructor. A second group of students some 31 per cent, reported visiting with course professors between one to two times. A third group indicated that they had three or more visits with their course instructor. The last group consisted of some 47 per cent of the student respondents Hence 78 per cent of the responding political science majors did visit with professors currently teaching their courses.

The companion question provided a 65 percent response of undergraduate political science majors who indicated that they had not visited with any non-course professor. Further, about 35 per cent of the respondees indicated that they had visited with professors who were not their current instructors. This inverse relation between student course enrollment and faculty contacts is expected However, the fact that about a third of the responding political science majors did contact non-course instructors is significant for its magnitude.

Though the opportunity to learn is increased by the growth in faculty -student contacts, it is the content of such person-to-person encounters which makes the opportunity of educational worth. One questionnaire item was designed to get some information on the content of the visits that students had with their course instructors. The alternatives from which the student selected within the questionnaire item were of two classifications: (1) academic counseling; (2) vocational counseling. The following alternatives were in the first category: (1) term papers; (2) examinations and/or grades; (3) course readings; (4) purely scholarly questions. The vocational sessions' alternatives were: (1) graduate and professional education; (2) "your career". Eliminating a category labeled "other" (some 4 per cent of the student respondents), about 84 per cent of the sample noted that they had advising sessions which were primarily academic. Some 12 per cent of the student respondents cited that their advising sessions were vocational in content. The ranking of these categories places the academic category as the students' highest concern, viz., (1) term papers, 52.3 per cent; (2) purely scholarly questions, 11.8 per cent; (3) examinations and/or grades, 11 per cent; (4) course readings, 9.3 per cent. Though the range of alternatives is not totally inclusive of all contents possible within a student-teacher visit, the student-professor visit reflects the intellectual bias and concerns of the undergraduate major in political science at Berkeley. Certainly this inference appears to be congruent with their notion of the mission of the university.

What is the role and to what extent do student study groups function in the political science curriculum? Is not student discourse a significant learning behavior? One question asked if student acquaintances in political science constituted informal study groups. About 81 per cent of the undergraduates responded positively. Indeed some 10 per cent of these students noted that this was the case quite frequently. The remainder of the reported replies, 19 per cent, indicated that this was not the case for them.

The companion question asked about the importance of student conversations in their political science curriculum. Seventy-two per cent of the respondents noted that inter-student conversations were important to their political science education; but 20 per cent of the student responses indicated no such regard for student conversations. Both the qualitative and quantitative facts suggest that study groups are educationally useful within the political science curriculum.

Successful learning is a function of the adequacy and appropiateness of resource allocation Certainly, class size and student participation in class are example of resource allocation. The opinions of Berkeley political science undergraduate majors on class size and adequacy of discussion time in relation to their own learning could provide some useful insights that could have bearing upon resource allocations.

Though the questionnaire did not provide a definition for the term "learning," about 69 per cent of the student respondees stated that class size was an important factor in their learning the field of political science. But 33 per cent of the students responded that class size had little or no importance to them as a factor in their learning. This writer suspects that the definitional problem with the term "learning" obscures the issue for the student's responding to the question. Whatever the definition, a two-to-one division of opinion on the class size as a factor in learning from the perspective of the student is a matter of no mean concern.

The questionnaire designers constructed an item to elicit the political science major's opinion on the adequacy of student discussion time during lecture sessions. Sixty per cent of the student responses noted that discussion time was adequate; while some 35 per cent expressed a contrary opinion. Of particular interest were the 5 per cent of the students responding who felt that questions were inappropriate within the lecture format.

The students' opinion on the adequacy of discussion time led to the question as to whether there was a relationship between that variable and the students' perceptions of class size in upper division and lower division classes. A ch-square statistic was calculated to determine the existence of an association. The results indicated that a significant association did exist. (See Charts Nos. 23-24 in Appendix.)

An attepmt was made on the basis of the questionnaire data to determine if an association existed between the two variables: (1) adequacy of discussion time in lecture classes; (2) importance of class size to learning. A chi-square statistic indicated a moderate association to exist. The vagueness of the undefined term "learning" manifested a low significant trend in these students' opinions. Though one might note that this relationship might be considered "natural" or "logical", the perception of adequacy of discussion time in lectures could have been otherwise, if the allocation of class time were different. Empirical clarification of the students' conceptions and expectations of learning would yield intelligent guides for allocating faculty telent within and between given units of instructional time-space.

In summary, the undergraduate political science major construes his discipline intellectually and perhaps humanistically, inasmuch as sociology and history are the most relevant disciplines for him. His concerns in the general areas of foreign and domestic affairs relate him to the problems and real issues of the world. Thus social criticism can be grounded in scholarship. His attendance to class, his reading patterns and advising contacts with faculty are opportunities for learning he often exploits. And his positive valuation of informal study groups is founded in the curricular usefulness of student discourse. All of these elements certainly are circumscribed by the assumption that class size and adequacy of discussion time are defined functions of learning.

IV

In the daily give-and-take with an academic faculty, students are bound to form collective impressions that characterize the life style of the department as an institutional whole. Though the questionniare upon which this paper is based was not structured to elicit systematically the undergraduate major's image of the Department of Political Science, an impressionistic collage is available.

A part of the student image of a university's academic department stems from the student valuation of the department's discipline, whether that evaluation is based upon personal experience in the discipline or an evaluation founded upon some folkloric reputation of the discipline. One such evaluation os the political science major's expectation of the discipline's comparative difficulty. Frequently

a discipline's difficulty is associated with its reputation for analytic and synthetic rigor and/or mathematization. Certainly, these undergraduate political science students do not associate political science with a rigor stemming from mathematics and statistics. Earlier it was seen that mathematics and statistics were held to be subjects least relevant to these students' study of political science. If mathematical rigor is not the criterion of difficulty, perhaps the comparison of political science with history and sociology can provide a clue, inasmuch as these fields were considered the most relevant outside fields.

Table No. 13 displays two distributions of student responses to questions on the comparative levels of difficulty of political science in relation to history and sociology. An assumption of such comparisons is the experience of students with these disciplines. For this reason, the students registering "no opinion" were considered as lacking experience with either or both of the disciplines. The rest of the student respondents were considered "knowledgeable" because of their registered opinions. The pattern is clear in Table No. 13. About one-third of the political science student respondents hold their discipline to be easier than history; while 6 per cent of these same students felt political science to be easier than sociology. At the other end of the scale of difficulty, a little more than one-fifth of the student respondees held political science more difficulty than history; while, 60 per cent of these same students believed political science to be comparatively more difficult than sociology. A logical

TABLE NO. 13: COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTIONS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' VALUATIONS ON DISCIPLINE DIFFICULTY

LEVELS OF DISCIPLINE DIFFICULTY	POLITICAL SCIENCE/ HISTORY		POLITICAL SCIENCE/ SOCIOLOGY	
	N	%	N	%
EASIER	84	32	14	6
ABOUT THE SAME	121	46	78	34
MORE DIFFICULT	58	22	138	60
TOTAL	263	100.0	230	100.00

analysis of this chart makes the following extrapolation plausible: the hierarchy of disciplinary difficulty, commencing with the most difficult is history, political science and sociology. It is a matter of further interest that the level of expected difficulty of the political science major and the comparative difficulty of the disciplines of history, sociology and political science were not distinguishably different across student majors. (See Charts Nos. 26-29 for statistical analysis.)

Direct student contact with departmental faculty occur in two contexts: (1) the advisory context; (2) the instructional context. Through both of these opportunities, students form impressions about the faculty as a whole.

Within the advising context, student respondents were to gauge their faculty advisor's interest level in the undergraduate student himself and in the undergraduate political science curriculum. In Table No. 14, the two frequency distributions of student responses are displayed. Chart No. 30 presents the comparison of these two distributions by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov One Sample Test. These distrubtions were found to be statistically different at the .01 level of significance. (See Chart No. 30 in the Appendix for statistical analysis.)

The collective image of the political science advisor is a mixed one. About one-half of the undergraduate majors who responded to the relevant questions felt that the faculty advisors were both interested in them as persons and in their undergraduate level of the

TABLE NO. 14: POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY ADVISORS' INTERESTS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJOR AND HIS CURRICULUM

INTEREST LEVELS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE ADVISOR	POLITICAL SCIENCE ADVISORS' INTERESTS IN:			
	POL. SCI. MAJOR		POL. SCI. CURRICULUM	
	N	%	N	%
Interested	146	50.2	136	46.9
Uninterested	56	19.2	31	10.7
Neither Interested Nor Uninterested	52	17.9	51	17.6
Don't Know	37	12.7	72	24.8
TOTAL	291	100.0	290	100.0

political science curriculum. It is apparent from Chart No. 30 that the students' greatest difficulty rested in their ability to distinguish the existence of a genuine lack of faculty interest in the student and his curriculum as opposed to their having information upon which such a judgement could be made. As would be expected, it appeared easier to the student to detect a faculty advisor's interest in him as person than for him to know the faculty advisor's interests and feelings about the undergraduate curriculum in political science. Hence, twice as many students registered their lack of knowledge about the faculty advisor's interest in the curriculum than those who did not detect a personal interest in them as persons by their faculty advisor. Nonetheless, the only positive category of faculty advisor interest included in the questionnaire was that labeled "interested". From that point of view, it is significant to observe that one-half of the students view their political science faculty advisor's level of interest negatively; while one-half of them view it positively. In a university coloring book, the political science advisor happily would be colored grey.

Another of the questions posed was the gauging of faculty advisor's knowledge of the curriculum's requirements. Some 60 per cent of the respondents stated that their faculty advisor was informed, 18 per cent reported their advisors to be uninformed, and the remainder did not know. But such a gauging is related, significantly, to the number of counseling sessions students have with advisors. (See Chart No. 31 in Appendix for statistical analysis.)

In the instructional context, a question on professorial reception of students during office hours was posed. Table No. 15 cites the specific question and the frequency and proportional distributions of the student responses to it. Almost eighty-six per cent of the students reported friendly receptions by the professors. Such appraisals, however are clearly a function of the number of contacts between student and faculty member. (See Charts Nos. 31-33 in the Appendix for statistical analysis.)

Two interesting questions on the undergraduate political science major's estimation of faculty-student acquaintanceship were posed. One question requested the student respondents to estimate the number of professor who knew them by sight and/or by name. The second question asked that they estimate the number of professors with whom they felt comfortable enough to ask for a written recommendation. Table No. 16 shows the facts. About 85 percent of the students responded to the first question stating that one or more professors recognized them by sight and/or by name. But only 60 per cent of these same students felt comfortable enough to request written recommentations from one or more course professors. Though visual and/or verbal recognition of students appears to be relatively high, correspondingly, the faculty recognition level of students for recommendation purposes is much lower with 25 per cent of these students recognizing this

TABLE NO. 15: FACULTY RECEPTION OF UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJOR

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

On the whole, how would you describe your reception (by professors) during these office hours?

RESPONSES	N	%
Very Friendly	128	51.0
Somewhat Friendly	87	34.7
More or Less Neutral	23	9.2
Somewhat Hostile	2	.8
Very Hostile	1	.3
Don't Know	10	4.0
TOTAL	251	100.0

TABLE NO. 16: UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' ESTIMATES OF THEIR ACQUAINTANCESHIP WITH THE FACULTY IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS:

(a) Estimate the number of political science professors who know you by sight and/or by name.

(b) How many political science professors would you feel comfortable asking to write a letter of recommendation for graduate school or a job?

RESPONSES	QUESTION (a)		QUESTION (b)	
	N	%	N	%
NONE	41	13.6	120	39.2
1 - 2	107	35.4	126	41.2
3 - 4	67	22.2	46	15.0
5 +	84	27.8	12	3.9
Don't Know	3	1.0	2	.7
TOTAL	302	100.0	306	100.0

difference. Of course the degree of relationship is a function of the number of inter-personal contacts between students and professors. This is supported by the high association between the frequency of student visits with professors and the two variables noted above, viz., (1) student estimate of number of professors who knew them by sight and/or name; (2) the student estimate of the number of professors with whom they were comfortable asking for written recommendations. (See Charts Nos. 33-34 in Appendix for statistical analysis.)

Student perceptions of the political values of the teaching faculty is another source of the student's image about the faculty. Two questions, one on the professors and the other on the teaching assistant, asked the undergraduate major in political science to categorize his instructors within the student's own political values. Tables Nos. 17-18 contain the questions and the student response data.

With reference to the political science faculty, some 47% of the students viewed them as having a similar political persuasion. Another 29 per cent of the student respondents viewed the faculty to their left; while, only 14 per cent perceived their professors in political sciences as more conservative than themselves. Across the lines of several majors, no statistically significant difference was determined. (See Chart No. 35 in the Appendix for statistical analysis.)

TABLE NO. 17 UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' COMPARATIVE ESTIMATION OF THEIR POLITICAL VALUES IN RELATION TO THOSE OF THE POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

In comparison with political science professors from whom you have taken courses, do you feel your political opinions, on the whole are:

RESPONSES	N	%
More conservative than those of the political science faculty;	40	13.6
More liberal than those of the political science faculty;	59	20.1
More radical than those of the political science faculty;	26	8.8
About the same as those of the political science faculty;	139	47.3
No opinion	30	10.2
TOTAL	294	100.0

TABLE NO. 18: UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' COMPARATIVE ESTIMATION OF THEIR POLITICAL VALUES IN REIATION TO THOSE OF THE POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACHING ASSISTANTS.

TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM:

In comparison with teaching assistants in political science courses you have taken, do you feel your political opinions, on the whole, are:

RESPONSES	N	%
More conservative than those of the political teaching assistants;	121	40.5
More liberal than those of the political science teaching assistants;	18	6.0
More radical than those of the political science teaching assistants;	10	3.3
About the same as those of the political science teaching assistants;	115	38.5
No Opinion.	35	11.7
TOTAL	299	100.0

The major in political science perceived the teaching assistant in a different pattern. The student respondent divided themselves equally between those who viewed the teaching assistants as being of similar political persuasion (39%) and those perceiving themselves as more conservative than ther teaching assistants (41%). Only 9% of the student respondents viewed the teaching assistant as further to the left than themselves. Across major areas, the students exhibited no statistically significant difference. (See Chart No. 36 in the Appendix for statistical analysis.)

If one pooled these opinions, the undergraduate political science major tended to perceive his instructors as being of similar and more conservative viewpoints than themselves (70%). Only 19 per cent of the student respondents perceived their teachers to be further to the left than themselves. (See Table No. 19)

Student political values are the lenses through which faculty persuasions are seen. Found in the Appendix, Charts Nos. 37-39 have cross tabulations of student responses between two variables: (1) the students' own political characterizations of their political views; (2) the students' political categorization of their instructors. A chi-square statistic was calculated for three distributions of the variables: (1) students' own political views/students' political categorization of professors; (2) students' own political views/students' political categorization of teaching assistants; (3) students' own political views/pooled students' political categorizations of professors

TABLE NO. 19: UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' COMPARATIVE ESTIMATION OF THEIR POLITICAL VIEWS IN RELATION TO THOSE OF THE POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACHING ASSISTANTS

RESPONSES	POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY (N)	TEACHING ASSIST-ANTS (N)	TOTAL	
			N	%
Undergraduate Political Science Majors' say they are:				
More Conservative than	40	121	161	27.2
Same as	139	165	254	42.8
More Liberal than	59	18	77	13.0
More Radical than	26	10	36	6.0
No Opinion	30	35	65	11.0
TOTAL	294	299	593	100.0

and teaching assistants. The chi-square statistic for each of these three distributions indicated that an association existed between the variables, at a high level of significance (.001) for each distribution. This means that the student's own political persuasion significantly affected their categorization of their professor's political persuasions. Such a distribution of student responses could occur only once in one thousand times. Similarly, the student's own political views positively affect their perception of teaching assistants. When the student observations on professors and teaching assistants were pooled and correlated with the students own political views, there is little doubt that the students' political lenses did systematically separate into categories the political persuasions of their instructors. Furthermore, these students read their instructor's political persuasions collectively to be predominantly liberal with a ratio of 2.1.

The undergraduate major in political science views his discipline and the instructional staff with a sense of moderate social distance, tempered by moderate friendliness. Political science is viewed by the students as a discipline of moderate difficulty, one that is humanistic in orientation. He views such a discipline as a moderately good fit for his intellectualism and propensity for social criticism. As far as the instructional staff is concerned, the faculty is known to be approachable and moderately concerned about the student's welfare in the curriculum.

V

But initial questions raise further questions. In examining the questionnaire, no data were gathered to provide direction to future curricular and administrative changes. Questions on the appropriateness and adequacy of the current undergraduate curriculum in political science, the qualitative effect of the quarter system upon the substantive division of course work and the adequacy of the rhythms of learning and teaching imposed thereby, and the training of activist citizens in domestic politics and government come to mind. To these must be added the omissions of evaluation of the political science major's competencies in the principles, knowledges and scholarly skills of inquiry appropriate to the achievement of explicity stated faculty goals for a baccalaureate major in the field. Without

evaluation studies, carefully done with the aid of educational evaluators. the effects of administrative and curricular changes cannot be ascertained. The best assertions, based upon the subjective estimates of faculty and the grade point averages, are without the warrant of evidence and are at most arguments from silence. Serious explicit inquiry in these matters is warranted if relevance in curriculum is to be achieved and maintained over time.

APPENDIX

F O O T N O T E S

[1]David Braybrooke, Philosophical Problems of the Social Sciences (New York: The Macmillian Company, 1965), pp. 1-17.

[2] For bibliographic survey of studies in college environments, see C. Robert Pace and Anne McFee, "The College Environment" in 1960 Review of Educational Research, ch. 3; and William B. Michael and Ernest L. Boyer, "Campus Environment, " in 1965 Review of Educational Research, ch. 2. Conceptually, the most rewarding class of studies were those which employed Murray's alpha-beta press concepts, e.g. George G. Stern, Morris I. Stein and Benjamin S. Bloom, Methods in Personality Assessment: Human Behavior in Complex Social Situations (Glencoe, Ill,: The Free Press, 1956). See also, Nevitt Sanford (ed.) The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962), chs. 13-15, 20-22.

[3]Albert J. Reiss, Jr., et al., Occupations and Social Status (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961), pp. 109-161. For the best current encyclopedic survey of social stratification with a good bibliography, see, Bernard Barber, et al., "Stratification, Social," Encyclopedia of Social Sciences (1968), Vol. XV, pp. 288-337. Also attention is drawn to the following theory development papers: (1) Kingsley Davis, "A Conceptual Analysis of Stratification," American Sociological Review, Vol. VII (June, 1942), pp. 309-332; (2) Kingsley Davis and Wilbert E. Moore, "Some Principles of Stratification." American Sociological Review, Vol. X, pp. 242-249; (3) Talcott Parsons. "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Sociological Stratification." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. XLV, No. 6 (May, 1940), pp. 841-862.

[4]For the relation of occupational aspirations and social and economic status, see the following illustrative studies: (1) R. Centers, "Social Class, Occupation and Imputed Belief," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LVIII (1953), pp. 543-555; (2) National Opinion Research Center, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," in Reinhold Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset (eds.). Class Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, In c., 1953) pp. 411-426; (3) H.A. Nelson and E.C. McDonagh, "Perception of Statuses and Images of Selected Professions, "Sociology and Social Research: An International Journal, Vol. XLVI, No. 1 (October 1961), pp. 3-16; (4) J. Pierce-Jones, "Vocational Interest Correlates of Socio-Economic Status for Adolescents, "Educational and Psychological Measurement Vol. XIX, No. 1 (Spring, 1959), pp. 65-71; (5) W.H. Sewall, et al., "Social Status and Occupational Aspirations, "American Sociological Review,

Vol. XXII (1957), pp. 67-73.

[5] For the years 1958-1966, 1.89 per cent of the UCB baccalaureates became doctorate holders. See National Academy of Sciences, Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: 1958-1966 (Publication No. 1489; Washington D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1967), p. 14.

[6] For the historical development trends and analysis of the discipline of political science, see: (1) Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenbaum, The Development of American Political Science (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967); (2) Ithiel de Sola Pool, Contemporary Political Science: Toward Empirical Theory (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967).

CHART NO. 1 SEC. INDEX OF OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE AND COMPARATIVE PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF 1967 OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS AND FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS OF BERKELEY UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE (1967).

MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS	SEC PRESTIGE INDEX†	PERCENT LABOR FORCE‡	PERCENT FATHERS' JOBS	+/- PERCENT REPRESENTATION
White Collar Workers:				
Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers	75	13.7	34.4	+20.7
Managers, Officers, Proprietors (except farms)	57	10.0	28.8	+18.8
Sales Workers	49)			
Clerical Workers	45)	22.8	12.6	-10.2
Subtotal		46.5	75.8	+29.3
Blue Collar Workers:				
Craftsmen and Foremen	31	13.2	7.4	- 5.8
Other Occupations not listed	19	----	8.1	+ 8.1
Operatives	18	18.8	1.3	-17.5
Farmers and Farm Managers	14)			
Farm Workers	9)	4.3	.6	- 3.7
Labor	7	4.3	2.3	- 2.0
Subtotal		53.5	24.2	-29.3
TOTAL		100.0	100.0	----

† Albert J. Reiss, Jr., et al, Occupations and Social Status (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961), pp. 109-161. The mean prestige index for all U.S. occupations is 30.

‡ Table No. 2.

CHART NO. 2: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Professional + Technical	7	11	22	20	7	3	8
Managerial + Proprietors	10	4	21	13	11	6	3
Clerical	5	4	9	5	3	0	1
Other	3	5	9	6	7	1	1
	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Professional + Technical	17.0	23.5	28.0	26.0	17.0	6.5	19.0
Managerial + Proprietors	22.0	9.5	27.0	25.0	23.5	14.5	6.5
Clerical	12.0	9.5	20.5	12.0	6.5	1.0	3.0
Others	6.5	12.0	20.5	14.5	17.0	3.0	3.0
TOTAL	57.5	54.5	96.0	77.5	64.0	25.0	31.5
R^2/n_j	826.56	742.56	2304.00	1501.56	1024.0	156.25	248.06
TOTAL R^2/n_j	6802.99						

$H = 13.68$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df. .05

CHART NO. 3: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/PARENTAL INCOME -- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test H.

PARENTAL INCOME	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Below $5,999	2	6	6	7	3	1	0
$6000- $9999	4	6	9	8	5	1	5
$10,000 - $14,999	12	10	24	11	7	3	2
$15,000 - $22.999	6	2	12	10	7	3	4
Above $23,000	3	6	11	7	5	2	4

PARENTAL INCOME	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Below $5.999	5.5	20.0	20.0	24.5	9.5	1.5	1.0
$6000 - $9999	13.0	20.0	28.0	27.0	16.0	1.5	16.0
$10,000 - $14,999	33.5	29.5	35.0	31.5	24.5	9.5	5.5
$15,000 - $22,999	20.0	5.5	33.5	29.5	24.5	9.5	13.0
Above $23,000	9.5	20.0	31.5	24.5	16.0	5.5	13.0
TOTAL	81.5	95.0	148.0	137.0	90.5	27.5	48.5
R^2/n_j	1328.45	1805.00	4380.80	3753.80	1638.05	151.25	470.45
TOTAL R^2/n_j	13,527.80						

$H = 21.01$ $H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 4: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/ FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS ---- Kendall Coefficient of Concordance Test, W.

FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Professional + Technical	7	11	22	20	7	3	8
Managerial + Proprietors	10	4	21	13	11	6	3
Clerical	5	4	9	5	3	0	1
Other	3	5	9	6	7	1	1

FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS	RANKING BY MAJORS							R_j	$\left(R_j - \frac{\sum R_j}{N}\right)$	$\left(R_j - \frac{\sum R_j}{N}\right)^2$
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.			
Professional + Technical	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	10.5	7.0	49.0
Managerial + Proprietors	1.0	3.5	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	12.5	5.0	25.0
Clerical	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	25.5	8.0	64.0
Other	4.0	2.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	21.5	4.0	16.0
TOTAL								70.0		154.0
Mean								17.5		

$W = .67$

$_W\chi^2 = 13.99$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 7.82,\ 3\ df.,\ .05$

CHART NO. 5: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/PARENTAL INCOME ---- Kendall Coefficient of Concordance Test, W.

PARENTAL INCOME	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Below $5999	2	6	6	7	3	1	0
$6000= $9999	4	6	9	8	5	1	5
$10,000 - $14,999	12	10	24	11	7	3	2
$15,000 - $22,999	6	2	12	10	7	3	4
Above $23,000	3	6	11	7	5	2	4

PARENTAL INCOME	RANKINGS BY MAJORS							R_j	$R_j - \frac{N}{2}(n+1)$	$(R_j - \frac{N}{2}(n+1))^2$
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.			
Below $5999	5.0	3.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	32.0	11.0	121.00
$6000-$9999	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	4.5	1.0	22.0	1.0	1.00
$10,000 - $14,999	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	2.5	11.0	10.0	100.00
$15,000 - $22,999	2.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.5	2.5	16.5	4.5	20.25
Above $23,000	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.5	3.5	3.0	2.5	23.5	2.5	6.25
TOTAL								105.0	29.0	248.50
Means								21.0		

$W = .55$

$W\chi^2 = 15.29$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 9.49$, 4 df., .05

CHART NO. 6: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/OCCUPATIONAL OBJECTIVES ---- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

STUDENTS' OCCUPATIONAL OBJECTIVES	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Bol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
International Government	--	1	19	6	--	1	--
US Government	3	1	8	4	--	2	8
Law-Business	6	6	10	4	27	3	3
College Teach.	2	11	4	11	1	3	--
E + S Teach.	9	2	2	6	--	--	--

STUDENTS' OCCUPATIONAL OBJECTIVES	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
International Governement	9.0	10.5	34.0	25.5	9.0	10.5	9.0
US Government	19.5	10.5	28.5	22.0	9.0	14.5	28.5
Law-Business	25.5	25.5	31.0	22.0	35.0	18.5	18.5
College Teach.	14.5	32.5	22.0	32.5	10.5	18.5	9.0
E + S Teach.	30.0	14.5	14.5	25.5	9.0	9.0	9.0
TOTAL	97.5	93.5	130.0	127.5	72.5	71.0	74.0
R^2/n_j	1901.25	1748.45	3380.00	3251.25	1051.25	1008.20	1095.29

TOTAL R^2/n_j 13,435.60

$H = 20.37$ $H_o < \chi^2 = 16.81$, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 7: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/OCCUPATIONAL OBJECTIVES ---- Kendall Coefficient of Concordance Test, W.

STUDENTS' OCCUPATIONAL OBJECTIVES	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
International Government	--	1	19	6	--	1	--
US Government	3	1	8	4	--	2	8
Law-Business	6	6	10	4	27	3	3
College Teach.	2	11	4	11	1	3	--
E + S Teach.	9	2	2	6	--	--	--

STUDENTS' OCCUPATIONAL OBJECTIVES	RANKINGS BY MAJORS							R_j	$R_j - \sum \frac{R_j}{N}$	$(R_j - \frac{R_j}{N})^2$
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.			
International Government	5.0	4.5	1.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	25.0	3.6	12.96
US Government	3.0	4.5	3.0	5.5	4.0	3.0	1.0	24.0	2.6	6.76
Law-Business	2.0	2.0	2.0	5.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	16.0	5.4	29.16
College Teach.	4.0	1.0	4.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	4.0	17.5	3.9	15.21
E + S Teach.	1.0	3.0	5.0	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	24.5	3.1	9.61
TOTAL								107.0	18.6	73.7
Mean								21.4		

W = .17

$_{W}\chi^2 = 4.65$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 7.82$, 4 df., .05

CHART NO. 8: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' POLITICAL VIEWS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' PARTY PREFERENCES.

STUDENT POLITICAL VIEWS	STUDENT PARTY PREFERENCES				TOTAL
	Dem.	Rep.	Indep.	Social.	
CONSERVATIVE	1 (16)	27 (6)	2 (6)	1 (3)	31 (11.6%)
LIBERAL	125 (104)	23 (39)	48 (44)	14 (23)	210 (79.0%)
RADICAL	6 (12)	0 (5)	5 (5)	14 (3)	25 (9.4%)
TOTAL	132 (49.6%)	50 (18.8%)	55 (20.7%)	29 (10.9%)	266 (100.0%)

$\chi^2 = 154.57$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 22.457$, 6 df., .001

C = .606

$H_o < \chi^2$ 22.457, 6 df., .001

CHART NO. 9 POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/STUDENTS' POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCES ---- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCES	FREQUENCIES BY MAJOR						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Communist	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Democratic	15	8	27	26	13	8	10
Republican	5	1	14	7	8	1	4
Independent	5	9	13	8	5	1	2
Socialist	2	8	6	5	1	1	1
POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCES	RANKINGS BY MAJOR						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law.	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Communist	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Democratic	33.0	25.0	35.0	34.0	30.5	25.0	29.0
Republican	18.5	10.5	32.0	22.0	25.0	10.5	16.0
Independent	18.5	28.0	30.5	25.0	18.5	10.5	14.5
Socialist	14.5	25.0	21.0	18.5	10.5	10.5	10.5
TOTAL	88.5	92.5	122.5	103.5	88.5	60.5	74.0
R_j^2/n_j	1566.45	1711.25	3001.25	2142.45	1566.45	732.05	1095.20
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	11,815.10						

$H = 4.61$

$H_o < x^2 = 12.59$, 6 df .05

CHART NO. 10: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/STUDENTS' POLITICAL VIEWS ---- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

STUDENTS' POLITICAL VIEWS	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Radical	--	11	2	6	2	2	1
Extreme Liberal	9	11	14	22	6	3	5
Moderate Liberal	16	5	36	15	16	6	9
Conservative	3	2	11	4	6	1	1

STUDENTS' POLITICAL VIEWS	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Radical	1.0	21.0	6.5	15.5	6.5	6.5	3.0
Extreme Liberal	18.5	21.0	23.0	27.0	15.5	9.5	12.5
Moderate Liberal	25.5	12.5	28.0	24.0	25.5	15.5	18.5
Conservative	9.5	6.5	21.0	11.0	15.5	3.0	3.0
TOTAL	54.4	61.0	78.5	77.5	63.0	34.5	37.0
R_j^2/n_j	742.56	930.25	1540.56	1501.64	992.25	297.56	342.25

TOTAL R_j^2/n_j 6,347.07

H = 6.87

$H_o < \chi^2$ 12.59, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 11: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/STUDENTS' POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCES --- Kendall Coefficient of Concordance Test, W.

POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Communist	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Democratic	15	8	27	26	13	3	10
Republican	5	1	14	7	8	1	4
Independent	5	9	13	8	5	1	2
Socialist	2	8	6	5	1	1	1

POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCES	RANKINGS BY MAJOR							R_j	$R_j - \frac{R_j}{N_j}$	$\left(R_j - \frac{R_j}{N_j}\right)^2$
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.			
Communist	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	35.0	14.0	196.00
Democratic	1.0	2.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	8.5	12.5	156.25
Republican	2.5	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	18.5	2.5	6.25
Independent	2.5	1.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	17.5	3.5	12.25
Socialist	4.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	25.5	4.5	20.25
TOTAL								105.0	37.0	391.00
Mean								21.0		

$W = .85$

$_{W}X^2 = 23.74$

$H_o < X^2 = 9.49$, 4 df., .05

CHART NO. 12: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/STUDENTS' POLITICAL VIEWS ----
Kendall Coefficient of Concordance Test, W.

STUDENTS' POLITICAL VIEWS	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Radical	--	11	2	6	2	2	1
Extreme Liberal	9	11	14	22	6	3	5
Moderate Liberal	16	5	36	15	16	6	9
Conservative	3	2	11	4	6	1	1

STUDENTS' POLITICAL VIEWS	RANKING BY MAJORS							R_j	$R_j - N$	$(R_j - N)^2$
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.			
Radical	4.0	1.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	24.0	6.5	42.25
Extreme Liberal	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	13.0	4.5	20.25
Moderate Liberal	1.0	4.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	11.0	6.5	42.25
Conservative	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	3.5	22.0	4.5	20.25
TOTAL								70.0	22.0	125.00
Means								17.5		

$W = .59$

$_{w}\chi^2 = 12.29$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 7.82$, 3 df., .05

CHART NO. 13: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY, MOST IMPORTANT --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Sci. Progress	--	--	1	--	--	--	--
Occup. Skills	3	--	6	--	3	--	2
Strength US	--	--	1	2	1	--	--
Int. Critic	20	24	49	43	20	9	13
Pract. Res.	2	--	--	--	1	--	--
Sense of Com.	1	1	5	2	2	3	1
FUNCTION OF THE UNIVERSITY	RANKINGS BY MAJOR						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Sci. Progress	9.5	9.5	22.0	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5
Occup. Skills	32.0	9.5	35.0	9.5	32.0	9.5	28.0
Strength US	9.5	9.5	22.0	28.0	22.0	9.5	9.5
Int. Critic	38.5	40.0	42.0	41.0	38.5	36.0	37.0
Pract. Res.	28.0	9.5	9.5	9.5	22.0	9.5	9.5
Sense of Com.	22.0	22.0	34.0	28.0	28.0	32.0	22.0
TOTAL	139.5	100.0	164.5	125.5	152.0	106.0	115.5
R_j^2/n_j	3243.38	1666.67	4510.04	2625.04	3850.67	1872.67	2223.38
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	19,991.85						

$H = 4.22$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 14: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY, SECOND MOST IMPORTANT --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pu . Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Sci Progress	8	4	11	9	1	4	6
Occup. Skills	9	3	13	14	6	1	5
Strenght US	--	--	1	2	--	--	--
Int Critic	1	2	7	1	3	2	3
Pract. Res.	1	1	3	2	2	--	1
Sense of Com.	7	14	24	17	14	3	2

	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Sci. Progress	33.0	26.5	36.0	34.5	10.5	26.5	29.5
Occup. Skills	34.5	23.0	37.0	39.0	29.5	10.5	28.0
Strength US	3.5	3.5	10.5	17.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Int. Critic	10.5	17.5	31.5	10.5	23.0	17.5	23.0
Pract. Res.	10.5	10.5	23.0	17.5	17.5	3.5	10.5
Sense of Com.	31.5	39.0	42.0	41.0	39.0	23.0	17.5
TOTAL	123.5	120.0	180.0	160.0	123.0	84.5	112.0
R_j^2/n_j	2542.04	2400.0	5400.0	4266.67	2521.50	1190.04	2090.67

TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	20,410.92

H = 6.74	$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 15: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY, LEAST IMPORTANT --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Sci Progress	3	2	3	1	--	1	--
Occup. Skills	3	5	6	2	3	1	--
Strenght US	11	14	32	29	20	7	12
Int. Critic	--	--	1	--	--	--	--
Pract. Res.	1	3	13	5	1	--	1
Sense of Com.	6	--	4	7	2	1	1
FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub.	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Sci Progress	26.0	22.0	26.0	16.0	6.0	16.0	6.0
Occup. Skills	26.0	30.5	32.5	22.0	26.0	16.0	6.0
Strength US	36.0	39.0	42.0	41.0	40.0	34.5	37.5
Int. Critic	6.0	6.0	16.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Pract. Res.	16.0	26.0	38.0	30.5	16.0	6.0	16.0
Sense of Com.	32.5	6.0	29.0	34.5	22.0	16.0	16.0
TOTAL	142.5	129.5	183.5	150.0	116.0	94.5	87.0
R_j^2/n_j	3384.38	2795.04	5612.04	3750.00	3343.67	1488.38	1261.50
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	20,534.01						

H = 7.67

$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 16: CONSISTANCY OF STUDENT VALUATIONS OF DISCIPLINES RELEVANT TO POLITICAL SCIENCE (Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient, r)

DISCIPLINES	RANKINGS		d	d^2
	MOST RELEVANT	SECOND MOST RELEVANT		
History	1	1	0	0
Sociology	2	3	1	1
Economics	3	2	1	1
Philosophy	4	5	1	1
Foreign Languages	5	6	1	1
Anthropology	6.5	7	.5	.3
Psychology	6.5	4	2.5	6.3
Mathematics/Statistics	8	8	0	0
				Σ = 10.6

r = .87	$H_o <$ r = .83, N = 8, .01

CHART NO. 17: CONSISTANCY OF STUDENT VALUATIONS OF DISCIPLINES RELEVANT TO POLITICAL SCIENCE (Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient, r)

DISCIPLINES	RANKINGS		d	d^2
	MOST RELEVANT	LEAST RELEVANT		
History	1	7.5	6.5	42.3
Sociology	2	7.5	5.5	30.3
Economics	3	5	2.0	4.0
Philosophy	4	4	0	0
Foreign Languages	5	2	3.0	9.0
Anthropology	6.5	3	3.5	12.3
Psychology	6.5	6	.5	.3
Mathematics/Statistics	8	1	7.0	49.0
				$\Sigma = 147.2$

$r = -.75$	$H_o < r = .64$, N = 8. .05

CHART NO. 18: CONSISTANCY OF STUDENT VALUATIONS OF DISCIPLINES RELEVANT TO POLITICAL SCIENCE (Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient, r)

DISCIPLINES	RANKINGS		d	d^2
	SECOND MOST RELEVANT	LEAST RELEVANT		
History	1	7.5	6.5	42.3
Economics	2	5	3	9
Sociology	3	7.5	4.5	20.3
Psychology	4	6	2	4
Philosophy	5	4	1	1
Foreign Language	6	2	4	16
Anthropology	7	3	4	16
Mathematics	8	1	7	49
				Σ = 157 6

r = -.87	H_o < r = .83, N = 8, .01

CHART NO. 19: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/LECTURE ATTENDANCE --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test. H.

STUDENTS' LECTURE ATTENDANCE	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp Gov.	Pub. Law.	Pol. Beh.	Pub Adm.
0 - 1/2	--	4	8	4	1	--	--
3/4	9	6	4	9	7	1	2
Almost All	10	22	54	35	22	11	14

STUDENTS" LECTURE ATTENDANCE	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. th.	Int. Rel.	Comp Gov.	Pub. Law.	Pol. Beh	Pub. Adm.
0 - 1/2	2.0	8.0	12.0	8.0	4.5	2.0	2.0
3/4	13.5	10.0	8.0	13.5	11.0	4.5	6.0
Almost All	17.0	18.5	21.0	20.0	18.5	15.0	16.0
TOTAL	32.5	36.5	41.0	41.5	34.0	21.5	24.0
R_j^2/n_j	352.08	444.08	560.33	574.08	385.33	154.08	192 00
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	2661.98						

$H = 3.20$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 20: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/ATTENDANCE AT T/A SECTIONS --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test H.

STUDENTS' ATTENDANCE AT T/A SECTIONS	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
0 - 1/2	4	2	12	9	4	2	3
3/4	4	8	12	6	6	--	1
Almost All	20	22	42	32	20	10	12

STUDENTS' ATTENDANCE AT T/A SECTIONS	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh	Pub Adm
0 - 1/2	7.0	3.5	15.0	12 0	7.0	3.5	5.0
3/4	7.0	11.0	15.0	9.5	9.5	1.0	2.0
Almost All	17.5	19.0	21.0	20.0	17.5	13.0	15.0
TOTAL	31.5	33.5	51.0	41.5	34.0	17.5	22 o
R_j^2/n_j	330.75	374.08	867.00	574.08	385.33	102.08	161 33
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	2794.66						

$H = 6.66$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 21: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/REQUIRED READING --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H

STUDENTS' REQUIRED READING	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol Beh.	Pub. Adm.
0 - 1/2	5	8	10	6	3	2	3
3/4	9	11	18	14	8	4	1
Almost All	14	13	38	29	19	6	13

STUDENTS' REQUIRED READING	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
0 - 1/2	6.0	9.5	12.0	7.5	3.5	2.0	3.5
3/4	11.0	13.0	18.0	16.5	9.5	5.0	1.0
Almost All	16.5	14.5	21.0	20.0	19.0	7 5	19 0
TOTAL	33.5	37.0	51.0	44.0	32.0	14 5	19 0
R_j^2/n_j	374 08	456.33	867 00	645.33	341.33	70 08	120.33
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	2874.48						

$H = 8.75$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 22: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/RECOMMENDED READINGS ----
Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks, Test. H.

STUDENTS' RECOMMENDED READING	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol Beh.	Pub. Adm.
0 - 1/2	27	28	62	45	27	10	17
3/4	--	1	3	1	--	--	--
Almost All	1	2	--	2	1	--	--

STUDENTS' RECOMMENDED READING	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol Beh.	Pub Adm.
0 - 1/2	17 5	19.0	21.0	20 0	17.5	15 0	16.0
3/4	4 0	9.5	14.0	9 5	4.0	4.0	4.0
Almost All	9.5	12.5	4.0	12 5	9.5	4 0	4 0
TOTAL	31 0	41.0	39.0	42.0	31.0	23 0	24.0
R_j^2/n_j	320.33	560.33	507.00	588.00	320.33	176 33	192 00
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	2664.33						

$H = 3.34$ $H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df. .05

CHART NO. 23: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' OBSERVATIONS ON LOWER DIVISION CLASS SIZE AND POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' OBSERVATION ON DISCUSSION TIME ADEQUACY

DISCUSSION TIME ADEQUACY	LOWER DIVISION CIASS SIZE		TOTAL
	TOO LARGE	GOOD SIZE	
ADEQUATE TIME	68.5 (76.4)	82.5 (74.6)	151 (62 7%)
INADEQUATE TIME	53.5 (45.6)	36.5 (44.4)	90 (37 3%)
TOTAL	122 (50.6%)	119 (49.4%)	241 (100 0%)

$\chi^2 = 4.47$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 3.84$, 1 df., .05

$\phi = .14$

$\chi^2 = N\phi = 4.46$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 3.84$, 1 df., .05

CHART NO. 24: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' OBSERVATIONS ON UPPER DIVISION CLASS SIZE AND POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' OBSERVATIONS ON DISCUSSION TIME ADEQUACY

DISCUSSION TIME ADEQUACY	UPPER DIVISION CLASS SIZE		TOTAL
	TOO LARGE	GOOD SIZE	
ADEQUATE TIME	64.5 (80.7)	102.5 (86.3)	167 (61.2%)
INADEQUATE TIME	67.5 (51.3)	38.5 (54.7)	106 (38.8%)
TOTAL	132 (48.3%)	141 (51.7%)	273 (100.0%)

$\chi^2 = 16.30$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 10.83$, 1 df., .001

$\phi = -.24$

$\chi^2 = N\phi^2 = 16.24$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 10.83$, 1 df., .001

CHART NO. 25: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' POINIONS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF CIASS SIZE TO LEARNING AND POLI SCIENCE MAJORS' OBSERVATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF DISCUSSION TIME

DISCUSSION TIME ADEQUACY	CIASS SIZE TO LEARNING		TOTAL
	IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	
ADEQUATE	116.5 (126)	59.5 (50)	176 (62 0%)
INADEQUATE TIME	86.5 (78)	21.5 (30)	108 (38 0%)
TOTAL	204 (71.8%)	80 (28.2%)	284 (100 0%)

$\chi^2 = 3.96$

$N_o < \chi^2 = 5.41$, 1 df., .02

$\phi = .15$

$\chi^2 = N\phi^2 = 6.39$

$N_o < = 5.41$, 1 df., .02

CHART NO. 26: DISTRIBUTIONAL COMPARISON OF POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' VALUATIONS ON DISCIPLINE DIFFICULTY (Kolmogorov-Smirnov One Sample Test)

	LEVELS OF DISCIPLINE DIFFICULTY		
	EASIER	ABOUT THE SAME	MORE DIFFICULT
f = Number of students ranking the comparative difficulty of political science to sociology.	14	78	138
$F_o(X)$ = Theoretical cummulative distribution of choices under H_o, viz the cummulative distribution of students' ranking the comparative difficulty of political science in relation to history.	.32	.78	1.00
$S_o(X)$ = Cummulative distribution of observed choices viz., the comparative difficulty ranks of political science in relation to sociology.	.06	.40	1.00
$F_o(X) - S_o(X)$	.26	.38	----

$D_{max} = .38$	
$N = 230$	$H_o < D = .11$, $N = 230$, .01

CHART NO. 27: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/STUDENTS' ESTIMATION OF MAJOR'S DIFFICULTY --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test. H.

STUDENTS' ESTIMATION OF P.S. MAJORS' DIFFICULTY	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am Gov	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub Adm.
As Expected	13	7	21	14	7	4	3
Easier	3	5	10	8	5	--	3
Harder	7	3	2	2	2	1	3

STUDENTS' ESTIMATION OF P.S. Majors' DIFFICULTY	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
As Expected	19 0	15.0	21.0	20.0	15.0	11.0	8 0
Easier	8.0	12.5	18.0	17.0	12.5	1.0	8.0
Harder	15.0	8.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	8.0
TOTAL	42.0	35.5	43.0	41.0	31.5	14.0	24.0
R_j^2/n_j	588.00	420.08	616 33	560.33	330.75	65.33	192 00

TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	2772.83

$H = 12.47$	$H_o < \chi^2$ 12.59, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 28: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/COMPARISON OF HISTORY TO POLITICAL SCIENCE --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

STUDENTS' ESTIMATION OF COMPARATIVE DIFFICULTY	FREQUENCIES BY MAJOR						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Political Science Easier than History	7	10	18	11	7	5	3
Political Sci-Same as History	12	11	29	20	16	3	6
Political Science Harder than History	6	4	9	13	3	2	6
STUDENTS' ESTIMATION OF COMPARATIVE DIFFICULTY	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Political Science Easier than History	10.5	13.0	19.0	14.5	10.5	6.0	3.0
Political Sci-Same as History	16.0	14.5	21.0	20.0	18.0	3.0	8.0
Political Science Harder than History	8.0	5.0	12.0	17.0	3.0	1.0	8.0
TOTAL	34.5	32.5	52.0	51.5	31.5	10.0	19.0
R_j^2/n_j	396.75	352.08	901.33	884.08	330.75	33.33	120.33
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	3018.67						

$H = 12.47$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59, 6$ df., .05

CHART NO. 29: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/COMPARISON OF SOCIOLOGY TO POLITICAL SCIENCE --- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Cariance by Ranks Test, H.

STUDENTS' ESTIMATION OF COMPARATIVE DIFFICULTY	FREQUENCIES BY MAJOR						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Political Science Easier than Sociology	--	2	2	1	1	1	--
Political Science Same as Sociology	10	4	21	15	9	1	7
Political Science Harder than Sociology	10	14	27	20	14	7	9
STUDENTS' ESTIMATION OF COMPARATIVE DIFFICULTY	RANKINGS BY MAJOR						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
Political Science Easier than Sociology	1.5	7.5	7.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	1.5
Political Science Same as Sociology	14.5	9.0	20.0	18.0	12.5	4.5	10.5
Political Science Harder than Sociology	14.5	16.5	21.0	19.0	16.5	10.5	12.5
TOTAL	30.5	33.0	48.5	41.5	33.5	19.5	24.5
R_j^2/n_j	310.08	363.00	784.08	574.08	374.08	126.75	200.08
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	2732.17						

$H = 5.01$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$ 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 30: DISTRIBUTIONAL COMPARISON OF POLITICAL SCIENCE ADVISORS' INTEREST LEVELS IN THE UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE STUDENT HIMSELF AND HIS UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM IN POLITOCAL SCIENCE (Kolmogorov-Smirnov One Sample Test)

	ADVISORS' INTEREST LEVELS			
	INTERESTED	UNINTERESTED	NEITHER INTERESTED NOR UNINTERESTED	DON'T KNOW
f = Number of students ranking political science advisors' interest in the undergraduate political science curriculum.	136	167	218	290
$F_o(X)$ = Theoretical cummulative distribution of choices under H_o, viz., the cummulative distribution of student ranking of political science faculty advisors' interests in the undergraduate student himself.	.50	.69	.87	1.00
$S_o(X)$ - Cummulative distribution of observed choices, viz., the cummulative distribution of student ranking of political science faculty advisors' interest in the undergraduate political science curriculum.	.47	.58	.75	1.00
$F_o(X) - S_o(X)$	.03	.11	.12	----

$D_{max} = .12$

$N = 290$

$H_o < D = .096$, $N = 290$, $\cdot .01$

CHART NO. 31: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' ESTIMATES OF FACULTY ADVISORS' KNOWLEDGE OF REQUIREMENTS AND THE FREQUENCY OF FORMAL COUNSELING SESSIONS.

NUMBER OF FORMAL COUNSELING SESSIONS	STUDENT ESTIMATE OF ADVISORS' REQ. KNOWLEDGE			TOTAL
	INFORMED	UNINFORMED	NEITHER+ DON'T KNOW	
3 +	40 (30)	7 (9)	3 (11)	50 (17.2%)
1 - 2	124 (123)	39 (37)	41 (44)	204 (70.1%)
0	11 (22)	7 (7)	19 (8)	37 (12.7%)
TOTAL	175 (60.2%)	53 (18.2%)	63 (21.6%)	291 (100.0%)

$\chi^2 = 30.67$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 18.47$, 4 df., .001

- $C_{adj.} = .38$

$\chi^2 = 30.67$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 18.47$, 4 df., .001

CHART NO. 32: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY RECEPTION OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND THE FREQUENCY OF STUDENT VISITS WITH COURSE PROFESSORS

CHARACTER OF FACULTY RECEPTION OF STUDENTS	FREQUENCY OF STUDENT VISITS WITH PROFESSORS				TOTAL
	5+	3-4	1-2	NONE	
Very Friendly	31 (23)	17 (15)	79 (82)	1 (8)	128 (51.0%)
Somewhat Friendly	13 (16)	11 (10)	61 (56)	2 (5)	87 (34.7%)
Hostile and Don't Know	2 (7)	2 (4)	20 (23)	12 (2)	36 (14.3%)
TOTAL	46 (18.3%)	30 (12.0%)	160 (63.7%)	15 (6.0%)	251 (100.0%)

$\chi^2 = 59.93$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 22.46$, 6 df., .001

$C_{adj.} = .44$

$\chi^2 = 59.93$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 22.46$, 6 df., .001

CHART NO. 33: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' ESTIMATES OF ACQUAINTANCESHIP WITH POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY AND THE FREQUENCY OF STUDENT VISITS WITH THE SAME FACULTY.

FREQUENCY OF STUDENT VISITS WITH POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY	QUESTION (a)				TOTAL
	5+	3-4	1-2	NONE	
5+	26 (13)	10 (8)	32 (46)	16 (17)	84 (28.4%)
3 - 4	11 (10)	6 (6)	42 (36)	7 (14)	66 (22.3%)
1 - 2	8 (16)	12 (10)	58 (57)	27 (22)	105 (35.5%)
NONE	0 (6)	0 (4)	28 (22)	13 (9)	41 (13.8%)
TOTAL	45 (15.2%)	28 (9.5%)	160 (54.0%)	63 (21.3%)	296 (100.0%)

$\chi^2 = 42.30$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 27.88,\ 9\ df.,\ .001$

$C_{adj.} = .40$

$\chi^2 = 42.30$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 27.88.\ 9\ df.,\ .001$

CHART NO. 34: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' ESTIMATES OF ACQUAINTANCESHIP WITH POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY AND THE FREQUENCY OF STUDENT VISITS WITH THE SAME FACULTY.

FREQUENCY OF STUDENT VISITS WITH POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY	QUESTION (b)			
	3+	1-2	NONE	TOTAL
3+	12 (13)	35 (29)	27 (32)	74 (26.9%)
1 - 2	26 (28)	66 (62)	63 (65)	155 (56.4%)
NONE	12 (9)	8 (18)	26 (19)	46 (16.7%)
TOTAL	50 (18.2%)	109 (39.6%)	116 (42.2%)	275 (100.0%)

$\chi^2 = 11.84,$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 11.67,$ 4 df., .02

$C_{adj} = .25$

$\chi^2 = 11.84$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 11.67,$ 4 df., .02

CHART NO. 35: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/STUDENTS' COMPARISON OF SELF WITH PROFESSORS IN TERMS OF POLITICAL VIEWS ---- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

STUDENTS' SELF COMPARISONS WITH PROFESSORS ON POL. VALUES	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
More Conservative	6	1	12	5	5	1	2
The Same	12	8	37	20	12	8	9
More Liberal	9	9	8	10	6	1	3
More Radical	--	7	2	9	2	1	--

STUDENTS' SELF COMPARISONS WITH PROFESSORS ON POL. VALUES	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
More Conservative	13.5	4.5	25.0	11.5	11.5	4.5	8.0
The Same	25.0	17.0	28.0	27.0	25.0	17.0	20.5
More Liberal	20.5	20.5	17.0	23.0	13.5	4.5	10.0
More Radical	1.5	15.0	8.0	20.5	8.0	4.5	1.5
TOTAL	60.5	57.0	78.0	82.0	58.0	30.5	40.0
R_j^2/n_j	915.06	812.25	1521.00	1681.00	841.00	232.56	400.00
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	6402.88						

$H = 7.71$ $\quad H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df., .05

CHART NO. 36: POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS/STUDENTS' COMPARISON OF SELF WITH TEACHING ASSISTANTS IN TERMS OF POLITICAL VIEWS ---- Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test, H.

STUDENTS' SELF COMPARISON WITH T/A'S ON POL. VALUES	FREQUENCIES BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
More Conservative	14	6	31	15	12	4	9
The Same	11	17	22	22	10	3	4
More Liberal+ More Radical	1	3	3	7	3	1	1

STUDENTS' SELF COMPARISON WITH T/A'S ON POL. VALUES	RANKINGS BY MAJORS						
	Am. Gov.	Pol. Th.	Int. Rel.	Comp. Gov.	Pub. Law	Pol. Beh.	Pub. Adm.
More Conservative	16.0	10.0	21.0	17.0	15.0	8.5	12.0
The Same	14.0	18.0	19.5	19.5	13.0	5.5	8.5
More Liberal + More Radical	2.0	5.5	5.5	11.0	5.5	2.0	2.0
TOTAL	32.0	33.5	46.0	47.5	33.5	16.0	22.5
R_j^2/n_j	341.33	374.08	705.33	752.08	374.08	85.33	168.75
TOTAL R_j^2/n_j	2800.99						

$H = 6.81$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 12.59$, 6 df.. .05

CHART NO. 37: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' POLITICAL PERSUASIONS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF THE POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY'S POLITICAL VIEWS

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY'S POLITICAL VIEWS	STUDENT POLITICAL PERSUASIONS			TOTAL
	CONSERVATIVE	LIBERAL	RADICAL	
MORE CONSERVATIVE	23 (5)	17 (31)	-- (4)	40 (15.3%)
THE SAME	9 (17)	123 (106)	5 (14)	137 (52.3%)
MORE LIBERAL + MORE RADICAL	1 (11)	63 (66)	21 (8)	85 (32.4%)
TOTAL	33 (12.6%)	203 (77.5%)	26 (9.9%)	262 (100.0%)

$X^2 = 117.76$

$H_0 < X^2 = 18.46,\ 4\ df.,\ .001$

$C = .56$

$X^2 = ww^{7-76}$

$H_0 < X^2 = 18.46,\ 4\ df.,\ .001$

CHART NO. 38: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' POLITICAL PERSUASIONS AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACING ASSISTANTS' POLITICAL VIEWS

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE T/A'S POLITICAL VIEWS	STUDENT POLITICAL PERSUASIONS			
	CONSERVATIVE	LIBERAL	RADICAL	
MORE CONSERVATIVE	31 (16)	87 (92)	1 (11)	119 (45.6%)
THE SAME	3 (15)	100 (88)	11 (11)	114 (43.7%)
MORE LIBERAL + MORE RADICAL	1 (4)	15 (22)	12 (2)	28 (10.7%)
TOTAL	35 (13.4%)	202 (77.4%)	24 (9.2%)	261 (100.0%)

$\chi^2 = 89.14$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 18.46$, 4 df., .001

$C = .51$

$\chi^2 = 89.14$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 18.46$, 4 df., .001

CHART NO. 39:: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN UNDERGRADUATE POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJORS' POLITICAL PERSUASIONS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF THE POLITICAL VIEWS HELD BY BOTH THE POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY AND THE POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACHING ASSISTANTS.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT POLITICAL VIEWS	STUDENT POLITICAL PERSUASIONS			TOTAL
	CONSERVATIVE	LIBERAL	RADICAL	
MORE CONSERVATIVE	54 (20)	103 (123)	1 (15)	158 (30.4%)
THE SAME	12 (33)	221 (192)	16 (24)	249 (47.9%)
MORE LIBERAL AND MORE RADICAL	2 (15)	78 (87)	33 (11)	113 (21.7%)
TOTAL	68 (13.1)	402 (77.3%)	50 (9.6%)	520 (100.0%)

$\chi^2 = 151.78$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 18.47$, 4 df., .001

$C = .58$

$\chi^2 = 151.78$

$H_o < \chi^2 = 18.47$, 4 df., .001